CHAPTER 13

FINANCE ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) coordinates the regional transportation needs for the Olympic and Kitsap peninsulas. For this purpose, the Regional Transportation Plan identifies the regional transportation needs for four counties: Clallam, Jefferson, Mason and Kitsap. Kitsap County is also part of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), the regional transportation planning organization for Central Puget Sound. Funding for regional transportation needs in Kitsap County is addressed in the PSRC transportation plan. Therefore, the finance element for the PRTPO Plan addresses the funding needs only for the three Olympic Peninsula counties: Clallam, and Mason.

The finance element addresses funding for regional transportation needs through the year 2010. Cost and revenue projections in the plan are for a 14-year period beginning in 1997. These projections are based on planning-level estimates, which provide a general measure of the relationship between costs and funding sources but do not identify specific funding for specific projects.

DESCRIPTION OF TRANSPORTATION ELEMENTS

At this time, the several elements of the Plan are at different stages of planning vis-à-vis cost estimates and funding sources. The following section describes the status of each element.

Roads

Several sources of information have been used to identify regional road needs. Regional road need categories include mobility, maintenance and preservation, environmental retrofit, economic initiatives, and safety. Mobility needs have been identified through an analysis of forecasted traffic growth and LOS standards. These factors determine capacity requirements for the regional road system. Differing levels of traffic growth – scenarios of 1.5 percent, 3 percent and 4.5 percent growth per year—and costs were estimated for the needs at each growth level. Capacity deficiencies for each growth scenario and related capacity improvements are summarized in Chapter 5 ("Regional Road System"). For the purpose of identifying financial requirements of capacity-related improvements to the regional road system, the PRTPO Funding, Finance and Prioritization Sub-Committee selected a single growth scenario which is a combination of the base growth rates for the forecast period: 4.5 percent per year for 1976-2003 and 3 percent per year for 2004-2010.

The State Highway System Plan (SHSP) for 1997-2016 and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (Regional TIP) for 1997-2002 also identify capacity or mobility needs. The mobility needs in these two plans were compared with the mobility needs identified through the PRTPO planning process. This comparison helped identify which mobility projects have planned funding. A more detailed discussion of this information is included in the section on Road Financing.

Information on maintenance, preservation and safety needs for the regional roads system is also available in the SHSP and the Regional TIP. These plans have allocated sufficient funding to address identified maintenance, preservation and safety needs. The Regional TIP identifies funding for a six-year period (1997-2002) and the SHSP identifies funding for a 20-year period.

Multi-Modal

Transit-related transportation needs are addressed in the Multi-Modal Chapter (Chapter 6). Potential funding sources for transit-related needs include several that can also be used for road needs. These include the Transportation Improvement Account (TIA) multi-modal uses) and ISTEA Surface Transportation Program (STP) Regional, Statewide Competitive and Enhancement funds. In addition, Federal Transit Agency Section 18 funds for Non-urbanized Area Transit Assistance are also available. The operating needs of transit systems in the Olympic Peninsula are funded through fare revenue, sales taxes and Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET) revenue. The four public transit agencies have developed a coordinated list of needs and identify funding needs for a six-year period (1996-2001). This information is included in the Regional TIP and has been summarized for review in the PRTPO Plan (**Table 7**, p. 16).

Also, the Washington State Ferry System is preparing their, own master plan. When it is completed and adopted, applicable recommendations will be incorporated into the PRTPO Plan.

Tourism

Recreational travel on the Olympic Peninsula is an important component for developing an assessment of transportation needs. It influences roadway capacity and design and the identification of future transportation corridors. In order to determine the impact of recreational travel, a more sufficient database is required. Recommendations include traffic studies, which would provide information on the mode, travel route, variations in season, day, and time of day for recreational traffic. Costs to meet tourist-related transportation needs and potential funding sources will be identified after further study is completed.

Freight

At this time, only base information has been collected regarding freight activity. The additional data needed to identify specific transportation projects (which specifically address freight travel) will be collected and analyzed during the FY 96-97 and FY 97-98 Work Programs. Costs and potential funding sources for freight-related transportation needs will be identified after further study is completed.

Non Motorized Transportation

Regional non-motorized transportation needs (e.g., bicycles and pedestrian needs) are addressed in Chapter 10. Potential funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects include sources that can also be used for another modes (ISTEA STP Regional, Statewide Competitive and Enhancement funds and State Mobility funds). Bicycle needs may also be funded through the WSDOT Economic Initiative program. A portion of the WSDOT construction program (0.3%) must be used for non-motorized transportation. In some cases, bicycle needs may be met by shoulder widening as part of a roads projects; in this situation, funding for bicycle needs would not be separately identified. Other potential funding sources include: the Non Highway Grant Program; a portion of city and county gas tax money (about 0.5% depending on size); 75 percent of all money collected by cities for bicycle licenses, fees and penalties; and, at the discretion of local jurisdictions, any funding available for roads may also be used for bicycle-related improvements.

Airports

The Plan identifies four airports in the region that are likely to have a major impact on the regional transportation system: Bremerton National Airport, Fairchild (Port Angeles) International Airport, Forks Airport and Jefferson County International Airport. All of these airports have prepared, or are in the process of preparing airport master plans that identify needed improvement in airport facilities and access roads. The information on regional airports will help coordinate airport and roadway transportation planning. Airport needs and funding sources are identified in the individual airport master plans. When the master plans for airports in the region are completed, this information will be incorporated into the finance element for the PRTPO Plan.

ROADS

Mobility Needs – Overview

Table 1 contains a summary of the forecasted mobility needs for the region, based on the analysis of traffic growth and LOS. **Table 2** provides cost estimates for mobility needs and indicates whether funding has been identified either in the SHSP or the Regional TIP. Both tables indicate how the various road segments have been classified using a tiering system.

TABLE 1

REGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

6/25/97

County	Link	Tier	Roadway	From	To	Improvements
Clallam/Forks	192.07	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Forks City Limit	Johnson St	Signalize/Channelization; Shoulders & sidewalk
Clallam	193.12	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Johnson St.	La Push Rd	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Designation
Clallam/P.A.	246.73	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	SR 112	Pine St	Discuss: PA alternate route or access management
Clallam/P.A.	248.06	1	SR-101/Lauridsen Blvd (T.C.)	Pine St	Lincoln St	Possible full interchange at Pine; Channelization under new bridge
Clallam/P.A.	0.00	1	SR-101/Lincoln St (T.C.)	Lauridsen Blvd.	Front St	Possible Lincoln/Peabody couplet; Alternate Arterial is Lauridsen to Golf Course
Clallam/P.A.	248.75	1	SR-101/Couplet/1st St. (T.C.)	Lincoln St	Race St	Also possibly use Scrivner or Lauridsen as alternate east-west route
Clallam/P.A.	249.12	1	SR-101/End Cplt/1st St (T.C.)	Race St.	Golf Course Rd	See strategies above and below
Clallam/P.A.	248.75	1	SR-101/Couplet/Front St (T.C.)	Lincoln St	Race St	See strategies above and below
Clallam/P.A.	249.12	1	SR-101/End Cplt/Front St (T.C.)	Race St	Golf Course Rd	Improve Golf Course/Hwy 101intersection
Clallam/P.A.	251.32	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Golf Course Rd	Myrtle St	Long term=Parkway east of Morse Creek passing near/thru Olympic National Park and back into Hwy 101. Short term: Access Management; address acceleration/merge; TWLTL
Clallam	263.45	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Deer Park Rd	Sequim City Limit	Promote Sequim bypass; Improve geometrics (curb radii) at Hwy 101 & Sequim Ave, 3rd Ave & 7th Ave intersections
Clal./Sequim	265.51	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Sequim City Limit	Sequim City Limit	Possible new county rods and/or alternate alignments
Clallam	274.64	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Sequim City Limit	Jefferson/Clallam C.L.	Truck climbing/Passing lanes; Cross section/Geometric Improvements
Jefferson	274.66	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Jefferson/Clallam C.L.	Old Gardiner Rd	Truck climbing/Passing lanes; Cross section/Geometric Improvements
Jefferson	282.25	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Old Gardiner Rd	Store Rd	Truck climbing/Passing lanes; Channelization

TABLE 1

REGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

County	Link	Tier	Roadway	From	To	Improvements
Jefferson	294.21	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Lords Lake Loop Rd	Quilcene City Limit	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Jeff/Quil.	294.62	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Quilcene City Limit	Center Rd	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Jeff/Quil.	294.90	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Center Rd	Washington St	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Mason	337.00	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Old Mill Hill Rd	SR 106	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Mason	339.48	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	SR 106	Purdy Cutoff Rd	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Mason	343.44	1	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Purdy Cutoff Rd	SR 102/Dayton Airport Rd	Construct 8' shoulder to allow Tourist Corridor designation
Mason	1.19	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Highway 101	Shelton City Limits	Possible channelization; Further study; Truck climbing/Passing lanes
Mason/Shelt.	2.18	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Shelton City Limits	Delaware St	Discuss: Create couplet in Shelton CBD or Alternate Routes
Mason/Shelt.	2.77	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Delaware St	Railroad Ave	Discuss: Create couplet in Shelton CBD or Alternate Routes
Mason	21.28	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Grapeview Loop Rd	North Bay Rd	Truck climbing/Passing lanes
Mason	24.95	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	North Bay Rd	SR 106	Truck climbing/Passing lanes
Mason	26.78	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 106	Cokelet Lane	Discuss: Widen to 5 lanes; Belfair Bypass; Access management
Mason	28.23	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Cokelet Lane	Mason/Kitsap C.L.	Signalization/Channelization; Widen to 4 lanes
Kitsap	34.14	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Mason/Kitsap C.L.	Riverside St	Discuss: Enhanced Transit; Widen to 4 lanes; Channelization/Signalization; Climbing lanes; Widen shoulder to 8' for bicycle touring
Kitsap	34.98	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Riverside St	Gorst	Discuss: Enhanced Transit; Widen to 4 lanes; Channelization/Signalization; Climbing lanes; Widen shoulder to 8' for bicycle touring; and Widen to 6 lanes creating HOV lanes

TABLE 1
REGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

County	Link	Tier	Roadway	From	To	Improvements
Kitsap	37.47	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Gorst	Bremerton City Limit	Widen to 6 lanes creating HOV lanes; I.V.H.S.
Kitsap/Brem.	40.43	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Bremerton City Limit	Kitsap Way	Widen to 6 lanes; HOV lanes; I.V.H.S.
Kitsap	50.34	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 308	Sherman Hill Rd	Widen to 6 lanes; HOV lanes; I.V.H.S.; Interchange Improvements; Enhanced Transit; Park & Ride lot
Kitsap	52.91	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Sherman Hill Rd	SR 305	Widen to 4 lanes; Access management
Kitsap	59.73	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 305	Babcock St	Widen to 4 lanes; Access management
Kitsap	60.02	1	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Babcock St	SR 104	Interchange connection at SR 104
Kitsap	24.85	1	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 302 spur	Sedgewick R/SR 160	Intersection safety at Anderson Hill Rd
Kitsap	28.16	1	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	Sedgewick R/SR 160	SR 166	Widen to 6 lanes creating HOV lanes; Enhanced transit
Kitsap	29.19	1	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 166	SR 3	Widen to 6 lanes creating HOV lanes; Enhanced transit
Jefferson	10.68	2	SR 19/Rhody Dr	Four Corners	SR116/Ness' Corner Rd	4-lane with left-turn pockets; Re-designate as urban/transitioning, if UGA defined
Jefferson	9.09	2	SR 19/Rhody Dr	SR116/Ness' Corner Rd	Center Rd	Improve shoulders for consistency with sections to the south. Access Mgt.
Jefferson	4.29	2	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Center Rd	Swansonville Rd	Improve shoulders for bicycles/RV's & re-designate as Tourist Corridor
Jefferson	2.61	2	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Swansonville Rd	Larson Lake Rd	Improve shoulders for bicycles/RV's & re-designate as Tourist Corridor
Jefferson	1.63	2	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Larson Lake Rd	Oak Bay Rd	Re-designate as tourist corridor
Jefferson	0.00	2	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Oak Bay Rd	SR 104	Re-designate as tourist corridor
Jefferson	8.26	2	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Four Corners Rd	Old Fort Townsend Rd	4-lane with left turn pockets; Access management
Jeff/P. Town	9.81	2	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Old Fort Townsend Rd	Mill/Discover Rd	4-lane with left turn pockets; Access management
Jeff/P. Town	10.78	2	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Mill/Discover Rd	Sherman St	Widen to 4 lanes (maintain TWLTL); Signals

TABLE 1
REGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

County	Link	Tier	Roadway	From	To	Improvements
Jeff/P. Town	11.79	2	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Sherman St	Benedict St	Widen to 3 lanes creating climbing & ferry holding lane; Signals; Access management; Widen shoulder to 4' for bicycle touring route
Jeff/P. Town	12.19	2	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Benedict St	Water St	Widen to 3 lanes creating climbing & ferry holding lane; Signals; Access management; Widen shoulder to 4' for bicycle touring route
Jefferson	8.87	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Center St	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Interchange at SR 19; 4-lane with left turn pockets; Access management
Jefferson	11.46	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Teal Lake Rd	Improve intersection at Teal Lake Rd; Acc Mgt.
Jefferson	13.88	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Teal Lake Rd	Paradise Bay Rd	Look at Paradise Bay Area traffic growth & limit access if appropriate
Jefferson	13.93	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Paradise Bay Rd	Kitsap/Jefferson C.L.	Widen bridge & raise speed limit accordingly; Provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities
Kitsap	15.50	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Kitsap/Jefferson C.L.	SR 3	Widen bridge; Provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities
Kitsap	21.50	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Bond Rd	Highland Rd	HOV Lane
Kitsap/King	24.10	1	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Highland Rd	West 1st St	HOV Lane
Kitsap	0.82	2	SR 160/Sedgewick Rd	SR 16	Bethel Rd	Channelization; Enhance transit; Improve pavement conditions
Kitsap	2.54	2	SR 160/Sedgewick Rd	Bethel Rd	Long Lake Rd	Channelization; Enhance transit; Improve pavement conditions
Kitsap	0.62	3	SR 303	SR 304	17th St	ACP overlay; Urban access control; Local arterial
Kitsap	1.46	3	SR 303	17th St	Sheridan Road	ACP overlay; Urban access control; Local arterial
Kitsap	2.75	3	SR 303	Sheridan Road	Riddel Rd	ACP overlay; Urban access control; Local arterial
Kitsap		3	SR-303/Waaga Way	Central Valley Rd	Old SR 303	ACP overlay; Urban access control; Local arterial
Kitsap	0.40	3	SR 304	SR 3	Charleston Beach Rd	Widening project programmed with re-alignment & capacity; Need for SR 3/SR 304 flyover (south to east); Urban access control
Kitsap/B. Isl.	0.35	2	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Winslow Ferry Terminal	Winslow Way	Implement regional multi-modal system (transit/pass. ferry only)

TABLE 1
REGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

County	Link	Tier	Roadway	From	To	Improvements
Kitsap/B. Isl.	2.31	2	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Winslow Way	Sportsman Club Rd	Poulsbo bypass; Intersection improvement
Kitsap/B. Isl.	10.69	2	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Sportsman Club Rd	Suquamish Rd	Need regional/local discussions
Kitsap/Pouls.	13.31	2	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Suquamish Rd	Poulsbo City Limit	Widen to 4 lanes; Poulsbo by-pass
Kitsap/Pouls.	13.51	2	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Poulsbo City Limit	SR 3	Widen to 4 lanes; Poulsbo by-pass
Kitsap		3	SR-307/Bond Rd	SR 305	SR 104	4-Lane; Intersection/interchange improvements
Kitsap/Brem.		3	SR-310/Kitsap Way	SR 3	SR 304	Intersection improvements; Alternative parallel routes
Mason		3	Brockdale Rd	McEwan Prairie Rd	Shelton Springs Rd	Inside UGA let go to LOS D
Clallam/P.A.		3	Marine Dr	Truck Route	Valley	High existing volumes; Probably need to do additional counts to identify type of usage and patterns; Long term: New N-S truck route on west end of town & southern e-W by-pass
Mason/Shelt.		3	Railroad/Shelton-Matlock Rd	City Limits	1st	Make couplet with Franklin St
Mason/Shelt.		3	Northcliff	Alder St	North 13th	Widen; Access management; Turn lanes & TWLTL
Mason/Shelt.		3	Shelton Springs Rd	City Limits	North 13th	Widen; Access management; Turn lanes & TWLTL
Mason/Shelt.		3	Olympic Hwy North	SR 101	7th St	Access management; Make couplet with Jefferson inside city
Mason/Shelt.		3	Alder St	7th St	1st	Make couplet with Pine St
Mason/Shelt.		3	Brockdale Rd	City Limits	Shelton Springs Rd	Widen; Turn lanes & TWLTL
Mason/Shelt.		3	North 13th	Shelton Springs Rd	Olympic Hwy North	Access management; Widen

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
Clallam/Forks	192.07	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Forks City Limit	Johnson St	1		$0.26-$0.38		
Clallam	193.12	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Johnson St	La Push Rd	1				$0.31-$0.46
Clallam/P.A.	246.73	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	SR 112	Pine St	1			$20.00-$105.00	
Clallam/P.A.	248.06	SR101/Lauridsen Blvd (T.C.)	Pine St	Lincoln St	1	TIP		In above	
Clallam/P.A.	0.00	SR101/Lincoln St (T.C.)	Lauridsen Blvd	Front St	1		$20.00–$116.00		
Clallam/P.A.	248.75	SR101/Couplet/1st. St (T.C.)	Lincoln St	Race St	1				In 2003 above
Clallam/P.A.	249.12	SR101/End Cplt/Front St (T.C.)	Race St	Golf Course Rd	1	In above			
Clallam/P.A.	248.75	SR101/Couplet/Front St (T.C.)	Lincoln St	Race St	1		In 2003 above		
Clallam/P.A.	249.12	SR101/End Cplt/Front St (T.C.)	Race St	Golf Course Rd	1	In above			
Clallam/P.A.	251.32	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Golf Course Rd	Myrtle St	1	In above			
Clallam	263.45	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Deer Park Rd	Sequim City Limit	1		$2.00 - $10.00		
Clal./Sequim	265.51	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Sequim City Limit	Sequim City Limit	1	State, TIP	In above		
Clallam	274.64	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Sequim City Limit	Jefferson/Clallam CL	1	State		$9.10-$12.10	
Jefferson	274.66	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Jefferson/Clallam CL	Old Gardiner Rd	1	State		In above	
Jefferson	282.85	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Old Gardiner Rd	Store Rd	1	State			$12.20-$16.30
	294.21	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Lords Lake Loop Rd	Quilcene City Limit	1			$0.46-$0.70	

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
Jeff/Quil.	294.62	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Quilcene City Limit	Center Rd	1			$0.13-$0.19	
Jeff/Quil.	294.90	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Center Rd	Washington St	1			$0.09-$0.19	
Mason	337.00	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Old Mill Hill Rd	SR 106	1			$1.55-$2.33	
Mason	339.48	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	SR 106	Purdy Cutoff Rd	1			$0.77-$1.15	
	343.44	Hwy 101 (Tourist Corr.)	Purdy Cutoff Rd	SR102/Dayton Airport Rd	1			$1.22-$1.84	
Mason	1.19	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Highway 101	Shelton City Limits	1				$2.90-$3.80
Mason/Shelt.	2.18	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Shelton City Limits	Delaware St	1	State	$4.10-$9.10		
Mason	2.77	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Delaware St	Railroad Ave	1	State	$0.02-$0.03		
Mason	21.28	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Grapeview Loop Rd	North Bay Rd	1				$9.40-$12.50
Mason	24.95	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	North Bay Rd	SR 106	1		$6.60-$9.80		
Mason	26.78	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 106	Cokelet Lane	1	State, TIP	$5.30-$20.50		
Mason	28.23	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Cokelet Lane	Mason/Kitsap C.L.	1	State, TIP	In above		
Kitsap	34.14	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Mason/Kitsap C.L.	Riverside St	1	TIP	$7.20-$10.00		
Kitsap	34.98	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Riverside St	Gorst	1		In above		
Kitsap	37.47	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Gorst	Bremerton City Limit	1		In above		
Kitsap/Brem.	38.73	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Bremerton City Limit	Kitsap Way	1			In 2003 above	

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
Kitsap	50.34	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 308	Sherman Hill Rd	1		$16.70-$22.30		
Kitsap	52.91	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Sherman Hill Rd	SR 305	1		$13.90-$18.50		
Kitsap	59.73	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 305	Babcock St	1	State	$11.10-$14.80		
Kitsap	60.02	SR 3 (Tourist Corridor)	Babcock St	SR 104	1	State	In above		
Kitsap	24.85	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 302 spur	Sedgewick Rd	1		$0.24-$0.36		
Kitsap	28.16	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	Sedgewick Rd/SR 160	SR 166	1	State	$14.60-$19.40		
Kitsap	29.19	SR 16 (Tourist Corridor)	SR 166	SR 3	1	State	In above		
Jefferson	10.68	SR19/Rhody Dr	Four Corners	SR116/Ness' Corner Rd	2			$2.80-$4.20	
Jefferson	9.09	SR19/Rhody Dr	SR 116/Ness' Corner Rd	Center Rd	2		$0.72-$1.08		
Jefferson	4.29	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Center Rd	Swansonville Rd	2		$3.68-$5.52		
Jefferson	2.61	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Swansonville Rd	Larson Lake Rd	2				$1.30-$1.94
Jefferson	1.63	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Larson Lake Rd	Oak Bay Rd	2				$0.48-$0.73
Jefferson	0.00	SR 19/Beaver Valley Rd	Oak Bay Rd	SR 104	2			$0.81-$1.21	
Jefferson	8.26	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Four Corners Rd	Old Fort Townsend Rd	2				$3.70-$5.00
Jeff/P.Town	9.81	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Old Fort Townsend Rd	Mill/Discovery Rd	2	State			$2.60-$4.00
Jeff/P.Town	10.78	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Mill/Discover Rd	Sherman St	2	State		$1.10-$1.40	

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
Jeff/P.Town	11.79	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Sherman St	Benedict St	2	State		$6.20-$8.30	
Jeff/P.Town	12.19	SR 20 (Tourist Corridor)	Benedict	Water St	2	State		In above	
Jefferson	8.87	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Center Rd	Beaver Valley Rd	1	State		In above	
Jefferson	11.46	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Beaver Valley Rd	Teal Lake Rd	1	State	$6.10-$8.20		
Jefferson	13.88	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Teal Lake Rd	Paradise Bay Rd	1	State	In above		
Jefferson	13.93	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Paradise Bay Rd	NW Bank Hood Canal	1	State	$0.50-$0.70		
Jefferson	14.67	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	NW Bank Hood Canal	Kitsap/Jefferson C.L.	1		$186.00-$248.00		
Kitsap	15.50	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Kitsap/Jefferson C.L.	SR 3	1		$186.00-$248.00		
Kitsap	21.50	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Bond Rd	Highland Rd	1		$2.32-$3.48		
Kitsap/King.	24.10	SR 104 (Tourist Corr.)	Highland Rd	West 1st St	1	State	$6.70-$8.90		
Kitsap	0.82	SR 160/Sedgewick Rd.	SR 16	Bethel Rd	2		$0.41-$0.61		
Kitsap	2.54	SR 160/Sedgewick Rd.	Bethel Rd	Long Lake Rd	2		$0.86-$1.28		
Kitsap	0.62	SR 303	SR 304	17th St	3		$4.40-$6.60		
Kitsap	1.46	SR 303	17th St	Sheridan Road	3		In above		
Kitsap	2.75	SR 303	Sheridan Road	Riddel Rd	3		In above		
Kitsap		SR-303/Waaga Way	Central Valley Rd	Old SR 303	3				

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
Kitsap	0.40	SR 304	SR 3	Charleston Beach Rd	3	State			$6.30-$8.40
Kitsap/B.Isl.	0.35	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Winslow Ferry Terminal	Winslow Way	2	State	$23.40-$53.20		
Kitsap/B.Isl.	2.31	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Winslow Way	Sportsman Club Rd	2	State	In above		
Kitsap/B.Isl.	10.69	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Sportsman Club Rd	Suquamish Rd	2	State	In above		
Kitsap/Pouls.	13.31	SR 305 (Tourist Corr.)	Suquamish Rd	Poulsbo City Limit	2	State	In above		
Kitsap		SR-307/Bond Rd.	SR 305	SR 104	3		$13.00-$17.50		
Kitsap/Brem.		SR-310/Kitsap Way	SR 3	SR 304	3		$0.80-$1.20		
Mason		Brockdale Rd	McEwan Prairie Rd	Shelton Springs Rd	3			$0.00-$0.00	
Clallam/P.A		Marine Dr	Truck Route	Valley	3		In previous		
Mason/Shelt		Railroad/Shelton-Matlock Rd	City Limits	1st	3		$0.80-$4.80		
Mason/Shelt		Northcliff	Alder St	North 13th	3		$3.20-$6.40		
Mason/Shelt		Shelton Springs Rd	City Limits	North 13th	3		$4.20-$8.80		
Mason/Shelt		Olympic Hwy North	SR 101	7th St	3		$0.80-$4.80		
Mason/Shelt		Alder St	7th St	1st	3		$0.80-$3.60		
Mason/Shelt		Brockdale Rd	City Limits	Shelton Springs Rd	3		$4.60-$9.20		
Mason/Shelt		North 13th	Shelton Springs Rd	Olympic Hwy North	3		$2.20-$4.20		

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
				Totals		All	$553.51 - $897.24	$44.23 - $138.55	$39.19 - $53.13
						Kitsap	$301.63 - $426.13	$0.00 – $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Olympic	$251.88 - $471.11	$44.23 - $138.55	$32.89 – $44.73
						Funded (All)	$79.02 - $144.83	$16.40 - $21.80	$21.10 - $28.70
						Funded (Kitsap)	$63.00 - $106.30	$0.00 - $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Funded Olympic	$16.02 - $38.53	$16.40 - $21.80	$14.80 - $20.30
				Grand Totals		All	$636.93 - $1,088.92		
						Kitsap	$307.93 - $434.53		
						Olympic	$329. 00 - $654.39		
						Funded (All)	$116.52 - $195.33		
						Funded (Kitsap)	$69.30 - $114.70		
						Funded (Olympic)	$47.22 - $80.63		
				Tier 1 Totals		All	$489.64 - $768.45	$33.32 - $123.44	$24.81 - $33.06
						Kitsap	$258.76 - $345.74	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 – $0.00
						Olympic	$230.88 - $422.71	$33.32 - $123.44	$24.81 - $33.06
						Funded (All)	$55.62 - $91.63	$9.10 – $12.10	$12.20 - $16.30
						Funded (Kitsap)	$39.60 - $53.10	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00
						Funded (Olympic)	$16.02 - $38.53	$9.10 - $12.10	$12.20 - $16.30
				Tier 1 Grand Totals		All	$547.77 - $924.95		
						Kitsap	$258.76 - $345.74		
						Olympic	$289.01 - $579.21		
						Funded (All)	$76.92 - $120.03		
						Funded (Kitsap)	$39.60 - $53.10		
						Funded (Olympic)	$37.32 - $66.93		
				Tier 2 Totals		All	$29.07 - $61.69	$10.91 - $15.11	$8.08 - $11.67
						Kitsap	$24.67 - $55.09	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00
						Olympic	$4.40 - $6.60	$10.91 - $15.11	$8.08 - $11.67
						Funded (All)	$23.40 - $53.20	$7.30 - $9.70	$2.60 - $4.00
						Funded (Kitsap)	$23.40 - $53.20	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00
						Funded (Olympic)	$0.00 - $0.00	$7.30 - $9.70	$2.60 - $4.00

TABLE 2: PENINSULA REGIONAL TRANSPORATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION – COST ESTIMATES

5/27/97

County	Link	Roadway	From	To	Tier	Funding: State, TIP=6 yr TIP	2003 Estimated Costs (M)	2007 Estimated Costs (M)	2010 Estimated Costs (M)
				Tier 2 Grand Totals		All	$48.06 - $88.47		
						Kitsap	$24.67 - $55.09		
						Olympic	$23.39 - $33.38		
						Funded (All)	$33.30 - $66.90		
						Funded (Kitsap	$23.40 - $53.20		
						Funded (Olympic)	$9.90 - $13.70		
				Tier 3 Totals		All	$34.80 - $67.10	$0.00 - $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Kitsap	$24.50 - $33.70	$0.00 - $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Olympic	$16.60 - $41.80	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00
						Funded (All)	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Funded (Kitsap	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00	$6.30 - $8.40
						Funded (Olympic)	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00	$0.00 - $0.00
				Tier 3 Grand Totals		All	$41.10 - $75.50		
						Kitsap	$24.50 - $33.70		
						Olympic	$16.60 - $41.80		
						Funded (All)	$6.30 - $8.40		
						Funded (Kitsap	$6.30 - $8.40		
						Funded (Olympic)	$0.00 - $0.00		

Balancing the costs of road needs identified in the PRTPO Plan with funding is a major challenge. At both the local and state level, priority use of available transportation funding is given to maintenance and safety needs so most of the existing funding sources are used to meet those needs. Additional funding sources or other balancing strategies are required to address capacity needs on the regional road system.

The project revenue forecasts in the State Highway System Plan are based on a continuation of past trends in highway funding, with future increases in funding consistent with past trends. Specific future funding increases have not yet been identified, although they may come from an increase in the gas tax or other transportation fees. Using this "trends-based" funding forecast, a portion of the mobility needs for the region would be funded. **Table 2** shows that, over the planning period of 1997-2010, capacity-related improvements on the Olympic Peninsula are reduced to between $329.0 and 654.4 million. Approximately $47.2 to $80.6 million (14 to 12 percent) in funding has been identified for these Olympic Peninsula projects, leaving a funding shortfall of $281.8 to $242.8 million.

Given the shortfall in funding for projected road needs (based on the existing funding conditions), the PRTPO has been examining a variety of approaches to use in balancing the plan, and developed a set of assumptions for each option. These assumptions affect both revenues and costs. Options discussed by the PRTPO Funding, Finance and Prioritization Sub-Committee included revising priorities for allocating existing revenues (i.e., so that some revenue would be available for mobility needs), seeking new revenues sources (e.g., using local option taxes, increasing state taxes), revising level of service standards, changing project priorities, and other approaches. The options described below evolved out of these Sub-Committee discussions. They have been reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Council/Policy Board. The PRTPO is currently considering this menu of options. Most of these alternatives would require significant policy changes; no specific combination of options has been recommended yet. The options for each category are explained below.

Existing Revenues

The current revenues would provide no money for capacity improvements. An alternative assumption is that some existing revenue would be re-designated from use for maintenance and preservation to use for capacity improvements (e.g., revising state and local priorities for transportation funding). Another alternative assumption is that jurisdictions develop a partnership for revenue sharing—for example, allocating some local funds for use on the state regional system.

Other Revenue Sources

The baseline assumption is that the State will increase taxes to fund transportation programs at historical levels, as projected in the SHSP. Alternative assumptions include levying additional taxes (e.g., local sales or gas taxes), privatization (i.e., revenue from

tolls) or other sources such as Transportation benefit District funding or other new federal funding.

Growth Assumptions

The baseline assumption assumes continuance of a growth rate based on historical patterns in the region. This growth rate is assumed to be 4.5 percent over the next few years, deceasing to 3 percent in the period after 2000. Alternative assumptions are that there will be no growth in the region, or that there will be a modified (lower) growth rate. Lower growth assumptions would result in lower projected capacity needs.

System Prioritization

The baseline assumption for the regional system has been that it is a single system in which all regional roads are of equal significance (a "one tier" system). Alternative assumptions are that certain regional roads should be identified as essential, lifeline routes (therefore, Tier 1 roadways), while other roads are secondary or tertiary in importance.

Under these alternatives assumptions, project needs on Tier 1 routes should, in general, receive the highest priority for funding, however, Tier 2 projects would also be considered for funding if circumstances (e.g., public safety, maintenance, etc.) warranted such projects taking precedence over Tier 1 needs.

Level of Service (LOS)

The timing and amount of project needs are determined by LOS standards and projected growth. The baseline LOS standards are Level C in rural areas and Level D in urban areas and along designated tourist corridors. Reducing these standards would postpone or reduce project needs. Alternative assumptions are:

- LOS D for rural areas and LOS E for urban areas and tourist corridors
- LOS D for rural areas and LOS F for urban areas and LOS E for tourist corridors
- LOS E for rural areas and LOS F for urban areas and LOS E for tourist corridors

Project Solutions

The currently identified roads costs are based on a range of project solutions. The project solutions proposed range from a minimum (e.g., installing a signal) to more complicated engineering solutions (e.g., reconfiguring the intersection) because project-level engineering has not yet been completed and it is impossible to determine the range of solutions that are appropriate to resolve the roadway problem. Alternative assumptions include using the project solution that is less expensive, or considering phasing in improvements over a more extended period of time to reduce the annual cost of the improvements. Another alternative assumption is that multi-modal options would be used instead of road improvements. These alternative assumptions would have the impact of reducing costs.

Specific options or strategies for balancing the mobility plan are addressed in the following sections.

Mobility Needs – Six-Year Plan

Projection

In the first six years of the planning period (1997-2003), a total of $251.0 to $471.1 million in mobility needs has been identified for projects in the Olympic Peninsula, excluding Kitsap County. The Regional TIP and SHSP include funding for $16.0 to $38.5 million of project costs, however, this leaves a funding shortfall of shortfall of $235.9 to $432.6 million (see **Table 2**).

Strategies

Strategies for balancing the costs within the six-year planning period need to rely on approaches that can be achieved over the short term. For this reason, strategies that require creation of new revenue sources (e.g., implementation of local ax options) are not suggested for balancing the plan over the short term. These types of strategies require significant lead-time to achieve the actual results in increased revenues both due to political processes and the lead-time required for collecting a new tax.

For the short term, the primary practical strategies for balancing the mobility plan are options that reprioritize or postpone projects. For example, by changing level of service standards or using a tiered approach to prioritize regional system needs, some needs forecasted in the first six years may be postponed to later years or even eliminated over the planning period.

The strategy of prioritizing projects based on dividing the roadway system offers several opportunities. For this strategy, the road system would be divided into three tiers: Tier 1 consists of the principal arterials in the system (US 1010, SR 3, SR 16, SR 104, SR 305); Tier 2 includes SR 19, SR 20 and SR 160; and Tier 3 is all other roads identified as part of the regional system. As shown on **Table 2**, for Olympic Peninsula projects only (excluding projects in Kitsap County which are addressed in the PSRC Metropolitan Transportation Plan), the total project cost for the six-year plan would be $230.9 million if only Tier 1 projects and only the low-cost project options were selected for implementation. The unfounded portion of these Tier 1 projects is $214.9 million. Therefore, while this strategy alone would not balance the six-year plan, it would reduce the funding shortfall. An alternative strategy could include phasing project construction over a period of time to permit balancing cost of the plan improvements.

The strategy of reducing level of service standards was not analyzed because the PRTPO has indicated that it does not support this option.

Mobility Needs – Long Term Plan

Projection

Alternative 1

Over the 1997 to 2010 planning period, the baseline projection (Alternative 1) for mobility needs in the PRTPO region shows a total shortfall of between $281.8 - $573.8 million. After the first six-year period, the baseline projection for mobility needs in the region shows a total shortfall of between$45.9 and $141.2 million for the 2004 to 2010 period. No Kitsap County projects were identified during this period, therefore, the total cost of Olympic Peninsula project needs remains the same ($45.9 and $141.2 million).

Table 3 shows the long-term shortfalls in fund projected during the entire 1997 to 2010 planning period under Alternative 1.

Table 3
Alternative 1 – Baseline Costs & Revenues
(in millions)

Alternative 1	1997-2003	2004-2007	2008-2010	Total
Costs:				
PRTPO Region	$553.51-$897.24	$44.23-$138.55	$39.19-$53.13	$636.93-$1,088.92
Kitsap County	$301.63-$426.13	$0.00-$0.00	$6.30-$8.40	$307.93-$434.53
Olympic Peninsula	$251.88-$471.11	$44.23-$138.55	$32.89-$44.73	$329.00-$654.39
Funded:				
PRTPO Region	$79.02-$144.83	$16.40-$21.80	$21.10-$28.70	$116.52-$195.33
Kitsap County	$63.00-$106.30	$0.00-$0.00	$6.30-$8.40	$69.30-$114.70
Olympic Peninsula	$16.02-$38.53	$16.40-$21.80	$14.80-$20.30	$47.22-$80.63
Un-funded:				
PRTPO Region	$474.49-$752.41	$27.83-$116.75	$18.09-$24.43	$520.41-$893.59
Kitsap County	$238.63-$319.83	$0.00-$0.00	$0.00-$0.00	$238.63-$319.83
Olympic Peninsula	$235.86-$432.58	$27.83-$116.75	$18.09-$24.43	$281.78-$573.76

Strategies

Continued use of strategies such as using a tiered system prioritization and using only the low cost solutions for projects could serve to reduce the projected shortfall.

Alternative 2

After reviewing strategies for reducing costs of the Plan, the PRTPO identified the use of a tiered system for prioritizing projects as a possible approach to balancing the Plan (Alternative 2). The costs shown in **Table 4** are for Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects identified in the PRTPO mobility plan.

The revenues shown are based on the funding currently identified for those projects in the SHSP and the Regional TIP. This information reveals that, relative to the $47.2 million funded for low-cost project solutions for the projects in the Olympic Peninsula (i.e., not including Kitsap County) under Alternative 1, there would still be a funding shortfall in excess of $241 million if the project list was reduced to address only the low-end project solutions for Tier 1 projects ($289.0 million in Alternative 2).

Table 4
Alternative 2 – Costs & Revenues for Tiers 1 & 2 on a Tiered System, Using Low-end Project Costs
(Excluding Kitsap County)
(in millions)

Alternative 2	1997-2003	2004-2007	2008-2010	Total
Tier 1:				
Costs	$230.88	$33.32	$24.81	$289.01
Funded	$16.02	$9.10	$12.20	$37.32
Un-funded	($214.86)	($24.22)	($12.61)	($251.69)
Tier 2:				
Costs	$4.40	$10.91	$8.08	$23.39
Funded	$0.00	$7.30	$2.60	$9.90
Un-funded	($4.40)	($3.61)	($5.48)	($13.49)

One option for addressing this shortfall is to reallocate the funding identified in the SHSP and the Regional TIP to pay only for Tier 1 projects. The total funding identified for the low-end cost project solutions for the baseline option (Alternative 1) is $47.2 million; $37.3 million of this is for Tier 1 low-end cost project solutions. If the difference were reallocated to Tier 1 projects, the shortfall for Alternative 2 could be reduced by another $9.9 million.

These results indicate that, based on currently identified funding, there would still be shortfalls under Alternative 2 for Olympic Peninsula roadways. Some of the

funding identified for projects in Alternative 1 could be reallocated to fund more of the Tier 1 projects in Alternative 2. However, the projected funding for the low cost solutions in Alternative 1 ($47.2 million) is still $241.8 million short of the amount needed to fund all of Tier 1 in Alternative 2 ($289.0 million).

It is important to note that any program that "prioritizes" roads into tiers based on function must also have the flexibility to allow urgent needs on lower tier roads to advance on the priority array.

Other Revenue Sources

To address these shortfalls, the PRTPO may want to consider other revenue sources, as a strategy for addressing mobility needs in the future. The following discussion identifies possible new revenue sources. This discussion includes some local options for new revenues, as well as some options for increasing state support. There is two options for local funding with exist in legislative authority to generate revenue for "highway purposes": the local option motor vehicle fuel tax and the local option vehicle fee. It is also possible that local jurisdictions could use existing general taxing authority (e.g., for property taxes or local option sales tax) to generate additional revenues for road needs. However, it is unlikely that these general revenue sources would be used for state highway purposes, the main component of projected mobility needs. The use of new local transportation revenues for State highway purposes would require a significant policy decision.

Local Option Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax: Counties may enact a fuel tax that is 10 percent of the state fuel tax, with voter approval. This tax is collected throughout the county, within and without cities, and is distributed back to the county and cities. At a tax rage of 2.3 cents per gallon, based on the current state tax of 23 cents per gallon, the Peninsula region counties (excluding Kitsap) could collect revenues of about $1,259,000 could be collected in each year. This would yield a total of $8.8 million through 2010.

Privatization: Under the Public Private Initiatives in transportation Program, the state is authorized to solicit proposals from the private sector for transportation projects. Under the Public Private Initiative, projects are identified by the private sector and selected by WSDOT. Projects are owned by the private sector during construction, turned over to the State and leased back for operations up to 50 years. User fees and tolls are authorized to allow a reasonable rate of return on investments. Theoretically, tolls could be collected on any road with privately constructed improvements. However, locations such as bridges present the most probable situations for use of privatization. For example, the Hood Canal Bridge might be a candidate.

State Toll Facilities: The state has authority to "establish and construct toll bridges and operate, finance and maintain such bridges" on any public highway for the purpose of crossing a body of water. Major reconstruction of the Hood

Canal Bridge might be a candidate for a state toll facility. It should be noted that the Hood Canal Bridge improvements are considered to be a statewide issue due to the bridge's significance to statewide interests and, therefore, are not included in the total costs shown for the three Olympic Peninsula PRTPO counties.

The Hood Canal Bridge generated funds to recover its construction costs through collection of a toll from 1961 to 1979 when the bridge was destroyed, and again from 1982 to 1985 when the toll collection was suspended following a citizen challenge over use of the collected funds. Tolls charged during the 1961-79 period were generally $1.50 per vehicle. Between 1982 (when the bridge reopened after repair) and 1985, the toll was raised to between $2.00 and $2.50 per vehicle. Assuming that a toll system could not be instituted any sooner than the year 2000 and assuming that a toll of $2.00 per vehicle would be charged (with a projected traffic volume of 18,23 in 2000 increasing to 24,503 in 2010), approximately $467,000 would be collected by 2010. If the toll were increased to $3.00 per vehicle starting in 2005, approximately $604,000 could be collected. These estimates may be low since the toll charged could be adjusted from the $2.00 charged in 1985 to an amount that reflects the value of a dollar in the year 2000.

State Transportation Revenues: The State Highway System Plan is based on a financially constrained scenario which projects that there will be some increases in state revenue source (through increase in taxes and fees) to meet historic funding trends. It is not certain whether the State Legislature will approve the increases in taxes and fees necessary to provide this level of funding. However, further increases in state transportation taxes and fees, above the historic trends, would help to balance the PRTPO Plan. Based on the distribution of State transportation revenue over a ten-year period from 1985 to 1994, the region received a total of $246.2 million **(Table 5)**. A one percent increase in this amount would yield $2.4 million over a ten-year period, or $240,000 per year.

Table 5
Distribution of State Transportation Taxes and Expenditures 1985-1994

County	State Tax Distributions and Expenditures
Clallam	$107,623,000
Jefferson	$80,832,000
Mason	$57,860,000
Total	$246,205,00

Example Scenario: **Table 6** provides an example scenario, which depicts potential additional revenues, which might be available for solving regional road needs.

Table 6
Scenario with Additional Sources of Revenue
(Olympic Peninsula Counties Only)
(in millions)

Current Law Budget		1997-2003	2004-2007	2008-2010	Total
Tier 1 & Tier 2 Costs		$235.28	$44.23	$32.89	$156.40
Tier 1 & Tier 2 Funded		$16.02	$16.40	$14.80	$79.22
Surplus/(Shortfall)		$219.26	($27.83)	($18.09)	($77.18)
Add'l Sources of Revenue*	**Add'l Revenue per Year**				
Local Option Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	$1.27	--	$5.08	$3.81	$8.89
1% Increase Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax					
Revenues and Distributions	$0.25	$0.75	$1.00	$0.75	$2.50
Local Option Vehicle Fee	$1.26	--	$5.04	$3.78	$8.81
Total Add'l Revenue	--	$0.75	$11.12	$8.34	$20.20
Surplus/(Shortfall) w/Add'l Revenue		($218.51)	($16.71)	($9.75)	($244.98)

*Collections of Additional Revenues begin in 2004 for Local Option MVFT, 2000 for additional (over and above historical increases) State Transportation Revenues, and 2004 for Local Option Vehicle Fee.

Mobility Needs – Conclusion

The analysis identifies some strategies to help balance the PRTPO Plan. The results indicate that an alternative based on existing conditions (existing revenues sources and adopted levels of service) does not create a balance Plan.

Alternative 2, combined with some source of additional revenue, provides some potential for balancing the Plan but requires significant policy decisions. This alternative requires action by the State Legislature to increase transportation funding so as to provide some funding for state mobility needs as projected in the SHSP, and action by the PRTPO to reprioritize projects based on a tiered system. Reallocation of existing revenues (e.g., what is already allocated to mobility projects in the SHSP) would be necessary, and additional new revenues would be needed to address the shortfall resulting under Alternative 2. Nevertheless, Alternative 2 presents a smaller shortfall than the baseline alternative.

This analysis has examined possible approaches to balancing the six-year and 20-year PRTPO plans. Implementation of any of these approaches will require policy decisions by the PRTPO to decide what direction to take to balance the Plan.

Roads – Other Needs

The State Highway System Plan identifies other needs for the regional road system. These needs include maintenance, preservation, safety, environmental retrofit, and economic initiatives. In the SHSP, all of these needs are fully funded and no additional

unfounded projects or needs have been identified for these purposes. Maintenance and preservation needs are identified based on the State pavement management system and annual amounts allocated to meet those needs. The following table summarizes the amounts allocated to the region (excluding Kitsap County) for these other needs over the 20-year period of the SHSP (1997-2016).

Table 7
Other Road Needs 1997 – 2016
(dollars in millions)

Category	Clallam	Jefferson	Mason	Total
Maintenance	$44.80	$30.20	$30.70	$105.70
Preservation	$68.10	$50.00*	$49.00	$402.60
Safety	$25.97	$9.17	$32.19	$67.33
Environmental Retrofit	$0.00	$0.00	$0.87	$0.87
Economic Initiative	$6.03	$22.23	$9.92	$38.18

*The SHSP (1997-2016) identifies $285.5 M in Preservation Costs. Of this amount, $244.6 M is listed under Bridge Preservation.

TRANSIT

Six-Year Plan

The PRTPO transit agencies (Jefferson, Clallam, Mason and Kitsap) have developed a combined six-year plan. The summary of this combined plan is provided in **Table 8.**

Table 8
Proposed Transit Expenditures and Un-funded Needs 1996 – 2001

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Funded	Unfunded
Preservation								
Rolling Stock	2,224,348	2,990,996	3,095,838	1,871,002	4,176,287	4,625,346	5,739,137	13,244,680
Facilities	1,249,425	6,664,000	9,379,000	5,764,000	1,877,000	1,852,000	13,582,425	13,203,000
Operations/Maintenance	22,060,249	24,012,214	24,432,384	24,604,010	24,624,411	25,523,503	142,192,44?	3,064,337
Sub-total Preservation	25,534,022	33,667,210	36,907,222	32,239,012	30,677,698	32,000,849	161,513,99?	29,512,017
Improvement								
Rolling Stock		326,000	615,000	15,000	30,000	555,000	'4,000	1,522,000
Facilities	902,800	1,774,500	1,095,000	165,000	542,600	40,000	850,400	3,670,500
Operations/Maintenance	252,000	349,900	113,800	313,000	202,000	368,400	687,300	911,800
Sub-total improvement	1,154,800	2,450,400	1,823,800	493,000	774,600	963,400	1,541,700	6,104,300
TOTAL TRANSIT	26,688,822	36,117,610	38,731,022	32,732,012	31,452,298	32,964,249	163,055,69?	35,616,317

Potential funding sources for transit-related needs include several sources that can also be used for road needs such as TIA (multi-modal uses) and ISTEA STP Regional, Statewide Competitive and Enhancement funds. In addition, Federal Transit Agency Section 18 funds for Non-urbanized Area Transit Assistance are also available. The operating needs of transit systems in the Olympic Peninsula are funded through fare revenue, sales taxes and MVET revenue.

Alternatives for addressing the unfounded transit needs will be addressed after the PRTPO identifies which transit projects shall be included in the regional plan.